



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 09/610,100 | 06/30/2000 | Jon Ebbe Brelin | SONY-13800 | 3109 |
| 28960 | 7590 | 03/10/2004 | | |
| HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP 162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD SUNNYVALE, CA 94086 | | | | |
| | | | EXAMINER WANG, LIANG CHE A | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2155 | PAPER NUMBER 12 |

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/610,100

Applicant(s)

BRELIN, JON EBBE

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-23, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 have been examined
2. The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal. Any drawing corrections requested, but not made in the prior application should be repeated in this application if such changes are still desired. If the drawings were changed and approved during the prosecution of the prior application, a petition may be filed under 37 CFR 1.182 requesting the transfer of such drawings, provided the parent application has been abandoned. However, a copy of the drawings as originally filed must be included in the 37 CFR 1.60 application papers to indicate the original content.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 27-32 allowed.
4. Claims 4 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the limitation of independent claim 27 "A system for monitoring schedule entries posted to an AV/C resource schedule bulletin board subunit, the system comprising: a) a resource device including a dedicated AV/C resource bulletin board subunit; and b) a plurality of control devices in communication with the resource device and capable of posting the schedule entries to the AV/C bulletin board subunit wherein each of the schedule entries include a unique node address corresponding to the control device posting the request and where in the control devices are further capable of submitting notify command frames

with schedule entries, wherein each notify command frame identifies a corresponding schedule entry, and further wherein the notify command frame instructs the resource device to monitor access of the schedule entries by the control device” in lights of applicants’ specification was not taught or suggested individually or in combination by the prior art of record.

The prior art of record doesn’t teach or suggest individually or in combination, a system and/or a method of monitoring schedule entries where the combination of claimed elements does not include a dedicated AV/C resource schedule bulletin board subunit and wherein the notify command frame instructs the resource device to monitor access of the schedule entries by the control device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 2, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al., US Patent Number 6,584,502, hereinafter Natarajan.
8. Referring to claim 1, Natarajan has taught an architecture for monitoring access of descriptors over a network (Col 2 lines 25-45), the architecture comprising a descriptor mechanism for posting and storing descriptors (Col 8 lines 52-59, Col 10 lines 21-31,

Art Unit: 2155

Figure 2 the control information (descriptor) of each control elements 204, is sent (posted) and stored in the data store 252,) and corresponding command frames submitted from the networked control devices (Col 10 line 62- Col 11 line 8, the networked control devices 204 uses the event handler 272 to monitor the data store), where each descriptors comprises a unique node address identifying the control device submitting the descriptor (Col 11 lines 4-8, the unique node address exists because when the event handler detects the change, it would notified the changes to the original element 204A,) and wherein the corresponding notify command frame instructs the descriptor mechanism to monitor access of data contained within the descriptor (Col 10 line 67 – Col 11 line 8) accessed by a competing control device (Col 10 lines 62-67, the policy engine is viewed as the competing device that accessed and updated the information stored in the data store.)

9. Referring to claim 2, Natarajan has further taught wherein the descriptor mechanism is a bulletin board subunit (see figure 2, the event server used for storing and posting control information is viewed as an bulletin board subunit) and the descriptor is a data entry (Col 10 lines 62-64, a event notification service being registered is viewed as a data entry.)
10. Referring to claim 12, Natarajan has further taught wherein the descriptor mechanism stores portions of data that are accessed by the competing control device (Col 10 lines 66-67.)
11. Referring to claim 15, Natarajan has further taught wherein corresponding notify command frames are submitted after descriptors from networked control devices (Col 10 line 62- Col 11 line 1.)

Art Unit: 2155

12. Referring to claims 16-17, and 25, claims 16-17, and 25 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-2, 15. Therefore, claims 16-17, and 25 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-2, 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3, 5-11, 13-14, 18-23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan, in views of Horiguchi et al., US Patent Number 6,513,064, hereinafter Horinguchi.
15. Referring to claim 3-11, 13-14, Natarajan has taught an invention as described in claims 1, 2, and 12, however, Natarajan has not taught the limitation recited in claims 3-11, 13-14. However, all the limitations in claim 3-11, 13-14 are stating the features of a Resource Schedule Board (RSB) within a bulletin board subunit with an Audio/Visual Control machine using IEEE-1394-1955 serial bus.

However, Horinguchi has disclose an invention with a Resource Schedule Board (RSB) within a bulletin board subunit with an Audio/Visual Control machine using IEEE-1394-1955 serial bus (see abstract, figures 1-37), such as a resource schedule bulletin board and wherein the data entries are resource schedule entries each comprising

Art Unit: 2155

a start time, a duration time and an interval time (figure 30-36); the AV/C standard protocol (Col 1 lines 18-29); the IEEE 1394 serial bus (Col 1 line 19).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Natarajan such that to includes all the features of a Resource Schedule Board (RSB) within a bulletin board subunit with an Audio/Visual Control machine using IEEE-1394-1955 serial bus as described in claims 3-11, 13-14.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Natarajan because Natarajan has disclosed a bulletin board typed server for storing information and providing notification of network elements by monitoring event changes in a network, and Horiguchi has disclosed a more advanced bulletin boards with an resource schedule board. Combining both Horiguchi and Natarajan would improve Natarajan's invention by having a more advanced bulletin board which includes many more advanced features such as time scheduling functions.

16. Referring to claims 18-24, 26, claims 18-23, 26 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 3-11, 13-14. Therefore, claims 18-23, 26 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 3-11, 13-14.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed 02/03/2004, paper number 11, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
18. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

- a. That: Natarajan does not teach providing access-monitoring capabilities of descriptors as claimed within the present application (page 11 lines 6-7.)

This is not found persuasive because in Col 8 lines 52-59, Col 10 lines 21-31, Figure 2, Natarajan teaches the control information (descriptor) of each control elements 204, is sent (posted) and stored in the data store 252, and in Col 10 line 62- Col 11 line 8, Natarajan further teaches the networked control devices 204 uses the event handler 272 to monitor the data store. Also see Col 15 lines 1-11, policy may be used to monitor, manage, and/or control a variety of network characteristics including QoS, security, access, usage, etc. Therefore Natarajan has taught access-monitoring capabilities of descriptors as claimed within the present application.

- b. That: Natarajan does not teach utilizing a notifying command frame and a descriptor mechanism to monitor access of data contained within the descriptor accessed by a competing control device. (page 11 lines 16-18.)

This is not found persuasive because Natarajan has taught notify command frame instructs the descriptor mechanism to monitor access of data contained within the descriptor (Col 10 line 67 – Col 11 line 8) accessed by a competing control device (Col 10 lines 62-67, the policy engine is viewed as the competing device that accessed and updated the information stored in the data store.)

Conclusion

19. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 2155

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (703) 305-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on (703)308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Liang-che Alex Wang 
February 18, 2004


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER